

**BRENNEKE DECLARATION**

**EXHIBIT J**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA

UGOCHUKWO GOODLUCK NWAUZOR,  
et al., )  
Plaintiffs, ) 3:17-cv-05769-RJB  
v. ) 3:17-cv-05806-RJB  
THE GEO GROUP, INC., ) Tacoma, Washington  
Defendant. ) April 13, 2020  
\_\_\_\_\_  
STATE OF WASHINGTON, ) Phone Conference  
Plaintiff, ) Rulings on Motions  
v. ) In Limine  
THE GEO GROUP, INC., ) 10:00 a.m.  
Defendant. )

VERBATIM REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS  
BEFORE THE HONORABLE ROBERT J. BRYAN  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Proceedings stenographically reported and transcribed  
With computer-aided technology

1 APPEARANCES  
23 For the Plaintiff JAMAL N. WHITEHEAD  
4 Nwauzor, et al.: PAGE ULREY  
5 Schroeter Goldmark & Bender  
6 810 Third Avenue  
7 Suite 500  
8 Seattle, Washington9  
10 MEENA P. MENTER  
11 Menter Immigration Law PLLC  
12 130 Andover Park East  
13 Suite 300  
14 Tukwila, Washington15 For the Plaintiff ANDREA BRENNKE  
16 State of Washington: LANE POLOZOLA  
17 MARSHA J. CHIEN  
18 800 Fifth Avenue  
19 Suite 2000  
20 Seattle, Washington21 For the Defendant COLIN L. BARNACLE  
22 The GEO Group: ADRIENNE SCHEFFEY  
23 Akerman LLP  
24 1900 Sixteenth Street  
25 Suite 1700  
Denver, ColoradoJOAN K. MELL  
III Branches Law PLLC  
1019 Refents Boulevard  
Suite 204  
Fircrest, Washington

1 prior history of L&I enforcement at the Northwest Detention  
2 Center or other institutions. That motion should be granted  
3 for the first phase of the trial, but denied if we get to the  
4 unjust enrichment argument. And also I think it should be  
5 denied regarding statements made by Labor & Industries  
6 employees for both phases of the trial. Those statements may  
7 be relevant and admissible. Generally, prior history of law  
8 enforcement -- of L&I enforcement at this and other similar  
9 institutions should be granted.

10 No. 6 is to exclude all evidence of work programs at state  
11 and local government facilities. I assume that the  
12 governmental immunity defenses will be part of this trial  
13 and, if so, that motion must be denied.

14 No. 7 is to exclude all evidence or argument suggesting  
15 that the ICE-GEO contract requires that GEO pay only \$1 per  
16 day. That motion is granted. That does not necessarily  
17 limit testimony as to why GEO pays a dollar a day, but I  
18 think it is clear that you cannot argue that the contract  
19 requires that they only pay a dollar a day.

20 No. 8 is to exclude any reference to the Northwest Center  
21 as the Northwest ICE Processing Center. That motion is  
22 denied. That is not something that could be confusing to the  
23 jury, and it can be explained to the jury and we can try to  
24 use the proper name of the center during the trial.

25 The next motion is No. 9, to exclude all witnesses not

1 previously disclosed. There are five witnesses named as part  
2 of that motion. The motion should be denied as to the  
3 Labor & Industries employees. That is Buchanan and Johnson.  
4 It should be denied as to GEO employees Ragsdale and Evans,  
5 provided that if the plaintiff wants to depose them, they  
6 should be allowed to do that before trial. As to Williams,  
7 the motion is granted.

8 Defense motion is to exclude argument and evidence related  
9 to the government-owned facility and residential exemptions  
10 to the Minimum Wage Act. This basically -- these issues have  
11 been, to some extent, resolved by prior rulings, and those  
12 rulings will stand. The motion is otherwise denied, and we  
13 will deal with those issues at trial. I guess that's all I  
14 want to say about No. 10.

15 Now we will turn to GEO's motions in limine at Docket  
16 No. 355. These are GEO's motions in limine in regard to the  
17 State's claim.

18 Excuse me. I need to oil my voice with cold coffee.

19 Motions in limine in Docket No. 355, No. 1 is argument  
20 that voluntary work program positions should have or could  
21 have been filled by non-detainee Washington residents or  
22 citizens. That motion is denied.

23 Motion in limine 2 is argument or evidence that the  
24 voluntary work program is a forced work situation that should  
25 be excluded. That motion should be granted, but the reasons

1 that employees -- that detainees' work is not excluded by  
2 this ruling. It is directed at the program, not individuals.

3 **Motion in limine No. 3 is for exclusion of evidence**  
4 **related to GEO's legal fees, including any request for**  
5 **compensation for legal fees sent to ICE.** That motion is  
6 granted. I don't know what kind of a side issue that might  
7 be, but it is not something that we need to get into. That  
8 motion is granted.

9 Motion in limine No. 4 is to exclude evidence or argument  
10 related to GEO's size, profitability, financial status or  
11 overall wealth. That motion is granted generally, but may be  
12 denied or the issue reopened when we get into the economic  
13 reality test evidence in the first phase of the trial. It  
14 may be relevant and admissible as to the damage and non-jury  
15 phases of the trial. Granting the motion should not exclude  
16 evidence that GEO permits detainees to work alongside its  
17 regular employees as a core part of its business model, and  
18 that GEO enjoys substantial financial benefits and profits as  
19 a result. That type of evidence may be relevant, although  
20 general evidence or testimony about the -- about GEO's size,  
21 profitability, financial status or overall wealth should be  
22 excluded.

23 Motion in limine No. 5, exclusion of evidence or argument  
24 that GEO is involved in other lawsuits. That motion is  
25 granted. I made a note that such evidence should be subject

1  
2 C E R T I F I C A T E  
3  
45 I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from  
6 the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.  
7  
89  
10 /s/ *Angela Nicolavo*11 ANGELA NICOLAVO  
12 COURT REPORTER  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25